## YIELD RESPONSE TO DROUGHT IN COMMON BEAN (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) VARIETIES

Efraín Acosta-Díaz, Josué Kohashi-Shibata, Alberto Escalante-Estrada, Jorge A. Acosta-Gallegos y Tomás Nava-Sánchez.

\*Centro de Botánica, Colegio de Postgraduados, Montecillo, México, 56230. \*\*Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales y Agropecuarias, Chapingo, México, 56230.

Improved rainfed bean varieties have been developed for the semiarid temperate region of Mexico. The adaptation to waterlimiting conditions is assumed to be due to genetic resistance which allows a variety to exhibit a rather good yield potential under water-limiting conditions. Muñoz (1990), proposed a model for the evaluation of crop resistance to drought, as follows: R = G + GxS, where G is the average yield of each variety under both irrigated and droughted conditions, and was called the generic; GxS represents the yield reduction of a variety due to drought stress and is called the specific component. A drought resistant variety should exhibit a high value for the generic and a low value for the specific component. The objective of the present work was to determine the drought resistance of four bean varieties (growth habit type III), based on their generic and specific response in yield and its components, using the formula proposed by Muñoz (1990).

MATERIALS AND METHODS. Varieties: Bayo Madero (BM), Bayo Victoria (BV), Flor de Mayo Bajío (FMB) and Pinto Villa (PV), of similar phenology, were grown in a greenhouse using 8 lt capacity pots in 1991 at Chapingo state of Mexico, and in the field in 1992 at Chapingo (CH) and Tecamac (T), state of Mexico. In the greenhouse and field the varieties were grown under two treatments: irrigated (control) and droughted. In the greenhouse, pots of control plants were watered to field capacity as needed to replace the water lost by evapotranspiration. In the field, control treatment was irrigated as needed.

In the droughted treatment, watering was withheld for 16 days in the greenhouse and 30 days in field, from the beginning of flowering to the date when plants exhibited permanent wilting condition (when they did not regain turgor overnight). The experimental design was a completely randomized with four replications for the greenhouse experiment, and a randomized complete block with four replications for the field experiments.

RESULTS. None of the four varieties exhibited generic effects in the field at CH. In contrast, those effects were detected in the greenhouse in BM and FMB for No. of pods/plant; in FMB and PV for No. of seeds/plant. Generic effects for seed yield and its components were registered in T. The highest values for G were obtained by PV and BV for seed yield; PV and FMB for No. of pods/plant, seeds/plant and seeds/pod; and in BV for 100-seed

weight (Table 1).

Table 1. Generic (G) and specific (GxS) effects of drought resistance in four bean varieties grown under irrigated and droughted conditions at two locations.

,	G					GXS			
TRAIT	BM	BV	FMB	PV	BM	BV	FMB	PV	
GREENHOUSE									
YIELD*	20.1	17.7	16.6	17.2	20.5	20.1	11.2	15.9	
NPPT	16.9	12.7	15.2	12.4	17.1	14.9	7.0	14.4	
NSPT	42.2	37.4	68.4	46.0	44.6	50.2	63.9	36.5	
NSP	2.5	2.8	4.5	3.6	0.1	0.7	0.9	0.0	
SW (g)	45.7	42.1	21.9	35.8	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	
				FIELI	CHAPINGO				
YIELD	10.0	10.2	8.4	9.9	6.2	6.5	2.6	2.6	
NPPT	9.4	7.6	9.5	9.4	6.2	4.0	3.1	2.7	
NSPT	25.8	21.3	35.5	29.5	17.6	12.0	15.4	11.2	
NSP	2.8	2.8	3.7	3.1	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3	
SW (g)	37.1	43.3	23.6	29.6	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.4	
	FIELD TECAMAC								
YIELD	15.5	16.8	13.5	18.5	16.4	15.8	10.1	13.9	
NPPT	11.3	10.7	13.4	14.4	9.8	8.2	7.0	7.3	
NSPT	36.8	33.4	51.1	56.3	36.1	25.8	36.2	30.6	
NSP	3.2	3.3	3.9	3.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.1	
SW (g)	41.7	46.4	25.6	31.9	3.2	9.7	3.5	7.3	

YIELD (g/plant); NPPT = No. of pods/plant; NSPT = No. of seeds/plant; NSP = No. of seeds/pod and SW = 100-seed wt.

Responses for the **specific** effects (reduction in seed yield and its components) were detected in both greenhouse and field-grown materials. The lowest values observed were: for seed yield in **PV** and **FMB** (greenhouse; field, **CH** and **T**); for pods/plant in **FMB** (greenhouse) and **PV** and **BV** (field, **CH** and **T**); for seeds/pod in **PV** and **BM** (greenhouse and field **CH**) and **FMB** and **BV** (**T**); for 100 seeds weight in **PV** (greenhouse) and **FMB** and **BM** (field, **CH** and **T**).

CONCLUSIONS. Based on the model proposed by Muñoz (1990), variety Pinto Villa was identified as drought resistant due to its high generic and low specific effects. On the other hand, Bayo Madero was the least resistant to drought stress.

## LITERATURE CITED

Muñoz-Orozco, A. 1990. Modelo matemático para evaluar la resistencia a sequía casos uno a seis. Evolución Biológica. 4: 93-106.